DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 612 HE 032 390

AUTHOR	Russell, Alene Bycer
TITLE	The Status of Statewide Student Transition Data Systems: A Survey of SHEEO Agencies.
INSTITUTION	State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
PUB DATE	1999-05-00
NOTE	51p.
AVAILABLE FROM	State Higher Education Executive Officers, 707 Seventeenth St., Suite 2700, Denver, CO 80202-3427 ($10).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	College School Cooperation; Data Collection; *Database Management Systems; *Databases; Education Work Relationship; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; National Surveys; Recordkeeping; *State Programs; Transfer Students; Transitional Programs

ABSTRACT

This monograph reports on a national survey of state higher education agencies concerning the current status of student transition data systems. The survey found that 48 states are currently addressing at least one of four student transition areas, with 42 states concerned with postsecondary education (PSE) to PSE transition, 33 states with K-12 to PSE, 21 states with PSE to work, and 4 states with work to PSE. Data systems used include unit record databases (most common), surveys, and aggregate/other data. Data issues most often identified as "significant problems" were: privacy and confidentiality (11 states), burden on data providers (9 states), and timeliness of data (8 states). Data systems were most often reported as adequate for support of policy development in the areas of "student progress/degree completion/time to degree" and "transfer and articulation." They were reported as least adequate to "workforce development/employer needs." Following an executive summary, individual sections of the report present findings and conclusions concerning: unit record data systems, surveys, data content of student transition data systems, data and policy issues, steps to be taken, and suggestions for ongoing study. Appendices include the survey instrument, state-by-state tables, and a list of survey respondents. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 434 612

THE STATUS OF STATEWIDE STUDENT TRANSITION DATA SYSTEMS: A SURVEY OF SHEEO AGENCIES

SHEEO

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY:

L. Walker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE STATUS OF STATEWIDE STUDENT TRANSITION DATA SYSTEMS: A SURVEY OF SHEEO AGENCIES

THE STATUS OF STATEWIDE STUDENT TRANSITION DATA SYSTEMS: A SURVEY OF SHEEO AGENCIES

Alene Bycer Russell

May 1999

SHEEO State Higher Education Executive Officers

© Copyright 1999
by the
State Higher Education Executive Officers
All rights reserved

Alene Bycer Russell is a Research Associate of the State Higher Education Executive Officers.

The State Higher Education Executive Officers is a nonprofit, nationwide association of the chief executive officers serving statewide coordinating boards and governing boards of postsecondary education. Its objectives include developing the interest of the states in supporting quality higher education; promoting the importance of state planning and coordination as the most effective means of gaining public confidence in higher education; and encouraging cooperative relationships with the federal government, colleges and universities and other institutional state-based associations. Forty-nine states and Puerto Rico are members.

Copies of this report are available from the SHEEO Office for $10.00 prepaid. Send request to State Higher Education Executive Officers, 707 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2700, Denver, Colorado 80202-3427; fax 303-296-8332.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

The Status of Statewide Student Transition Data Systems: A Survey of SHEEO Agencies 3
- Introduction 3
- Overview 4
- Unit Record Data Systems 8
- Surveys 11
- Data Content of Student Transition Data Systems 13
- Data and Policy Issues 14
- Steps To Be Taken 17
- Suggestions for Ongoing Study 19

Tables

- Table 1: Student Transition Areas Addressed by Type of Data Used 5
- Table 2: Postsecondary Database Linkages to Other Types of Unit Record Data 10
- Table 3: Types of Surveys Conducted 12
- Table 4: Types of Data Encompassed by Student Transition Data Systems 13
- Table 5: Degree of Difficulty in Addressing Data Issues 15
- Table 6: Usefulness of Data Systems to Support Policy Development 16

Appendices

- Appendix A: Survey Instrument 23
- Appendix B: State-by-State Tables
  - B-1: Student Transition Areas Addressed by Types of Data Used 30
  - B-2: Status of Statewide Student Unit Record Databases: Results from a 1995 SHEEO Survey 33
  - B-3: Postsecondary Database Linkages to Other Unit Record Systems 34
  - B-4: High School Feedback Reports 37
  - B-5: Types of Surveys Conducted 38
  - B-6: Linkages of Survey Data to Other Data Systems 41
  - B-7: Types of Data Encompassed by Student Transition Data Systems 42
- Appendix C: Survey Respondents 47

Executive Summary

For two decades, the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) has both supported and monitored developments in statewide higher education data systems through activities of the SHEEO/NCES Communication Network. The impetus for the current study came from the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC) Working Group on Examination of Policy and Data Issues at Points of Student Transitions. This group asked SHEEO to provide information on state-level data systems related to four transition areas of interest:

- K-12 to postsecondary education (K-12 to PSE)
- Postsecondary education to postsecondary education (PSE to PSE)
- Postsecondary education to work (PSE to Work)
- Work to postsecondary education (Work to PSE)

In February 1999, SHEEO conducted a survey of its member agencies to determine their views of the current status of student transition data systems in the states. This executive summary highlights the study findings.

Overview

Forty-eight states are currently addressing at least one student transition area, and a majority are addressing two or more transitions.

States most often examine the PSE to PSE transition area (42 states), followed by K-12 to PSE (33 states), PSE to Work (21 states), and Work to PSE (4 states).

States use different kinds of data to address student transitions, including unit record databases, surveys, and aggregate/other data.

- Unit record databases are used to study all student transitions, but they are particularly dominant in the study of PSE to PSE.
- Surveys are used much less often than unit record databases, but they do play a strong role in the study of PSE to Work.
- Even when unit record and/or survey data exist, states also use aggregate data in the study of student transitions, particularly to examine K-12 to PSE issues.

Unit Record Data Systems

Comprehensive statewide unit record data systems are widespread among SHEEO agencies and exist in about two-thirds of the states. In a smaller number of states, the SHEEO agency maintains a less comprehensive data system or other agencies manage such a database. In just a few states, there are no multi-institutional postsecondary databases at all. This pattern has remained largely unchanged since 1995 when SHEEO last collected this information.

In 28 states, statewide postsecondary unit record databases are currently being linked to other kinds of databases on a record-by-record basis. Linkages to ACT/SAT data are

most frequent (17 states), but there are linkages to community college databases, Unemployment Insurance databases, State Department of Education (K-12) databases, and others as well. There has been modest expansion in this area over the past few years, but the growth has not been as great as was anticipated in the 1995 survey.

Twenty-one states currently produce a high school feedback report based on unit record data.

SURVEYS

Twenty-four states engage in regular or ad hoc surveys that relate to student and employment topics, but only 14 of them use these surveys to address student transitions. A few states noted that they conduct surveys more for accountability purposes than for policy development.

- Alumni/postsecondary follow-up surveys are conducted in 15 states.
- Postsecondary student surveys are found in 14 states.
- Employer surveys are conducted in 11 states.
- Also mentioned are secondary student follow-up surveys (8 states), adult/general population surveys (5 states), and employee surveys (5 states).

Only rarely are survey data linked to other kinds of databases.

DATA AND POLICY ISSUES

The data issues most often identified as "significant problems" are: privacy and confidentiality (11 states), burden on data providers (9 states), and timeliness of data (8 states).

Data systems are most often reported as adequate for support of policy development in the areas of: "student progress/degree completion/time to degree" and "transfer and articulation," both of which are PSE to PSE issues. They are reported as least adequate to deal with "mobility/migration of college graduates" and "workforce development/employer needs," both PSE to Work issues.

STEPS TO BE TAKEN

In open-ended questions, respondents outlined crucial areas where steps need to be taken, both in their own states and nationally:

- privacy/confidentiality
- data sharing
- developing statewide databases
- consistent definitions
- data burden
- resource issues

Several study findings have suggested areas for further investigation.

The Status of Statewide Student Transition Data Systems: A Survey of SHEEO Agencies

The Status of Statewide Student Transition Data Systems: A Survey of SHEEO Agencies

INTRODUCTION

For two decades, the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) has both supported and monitored developments in statewide higher education data systems. Through the activities of the SHEEO/NCES Communication Network--its national meetings, publications, personnel exchanges, and other networking activities, SHEEO has contributed to the expanding capabilities and quality of state-level data systems. The Network has also tracked these developments through periodic status reports. Some reports have focused on specific issues of the day, such as the 1991 report which addressed SHEEO agency capabilities to report postsecondary graduation rates in the light of the recently passed Student Right-to-know and Campus Security Act.[1] Other publications have provided more general updates, such as the 1995 SHEEO report describing advances in statewide postsecondary unit record data systems and growing linkages to other kinds of state-level databases.[2] This report again is more focused, addressing the topic of "student transition data systems."

The impetus for this study came from the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative (NPEC) Working Group on Examination of Policy and Data Issues at Points of Student Transitions. In 1998, this group asked SHEEO to provide some information on state-level data systems related to four transition areas of interest:

- K-12 to postsecondary education (K-12 to PSE)
- Postsecondary education to postsecondary education (PSE to PSE)
- Postsecondary education to work (PSE to Work)
- Work to postsecondary education (Work to PSE)

While SHEEO agency data systems represent only a part of the Working Group's interest, this gave us the opportunity to update information from previous surveys and to expand into some

---

[1] Lenth, Charles S. and Alene Bycer Russell. *Statewide Student Data Systems and Capabilities to Report Postsecondary Graduation Rates*, State Higher Education Executive Officers, November 1991.
[2] Russell, Alene Bycer. *Advances in Statewide Higher Education Data Systems*, State Higher Education Executive Officers, October 1995.

new areas. In February 1999, SHEEO undertook a survey of its member agencies to provide their views of the current status of student transition data systems in the states. This survey looked not only at how states use unit record databases to address student transitions, but also at how surveys and aggregate/other data are being used. The survey examined how successfully these data systems are working, and what steps need to be taken in the future. The survey instrument is included in Appendix A.

Forty-nine states and Puerto Rico responded to the survey for a total of 50 survey responses. Only Montana did not participate. For convenience, the word "state" is used throughout this report to refer to all jurisdictions, including Puerto Rico.

National summary tables are included in the text of this report. State-by-state information is reported in Appendix B. Readers should keep in mind that these findings reflect the responses of SHEEO agency personnel only,[3] and may or may not cover the full range of statewide student transition data systems. For example, in some states, community college agencies are developing separate capabilities to track the postsecondary to work transition. A list of survey respondents is provided in Appendix C.

OVERVIEW

Transition areas addressed. In nearly every state, the state higher education agency currently addresses student transitions of one type or another: 48 of 50 respondents identified at least one transition area they currently explore. Higher education agencies most often examine the PSE to PSE transition area (42 states), followed by K-12 to PSE (33 states). A substantial number currently examine PSE to Work transitions (21 states), while just a few look at Work to PSE (4 states).

It is noteworthy that 34 states address at least two transition areas, and 15 states address at least three transitions. The following pattern emerged:

[3] One exception occurred in the state of Washington where the SHEEO staff member forwarded our survey to another organization, the Washington State Graduate Follow-up Study, which was able to provide a broader overview of the state's activities.

- Fourteen states examine the three main transition areas (K-12 to PSE, PSE to PSE, and PSE to Work), tracking the chronological progress of students from K-12 through postsecondary education to work. (Three of these states also address the fourth transition area, Work to PSE.)
- Thirteen additional states examine the K-12 to PSE, and PSE to PSE transitions, looking at the early parts of the student career, but not investigating work-related issues.
- Another five states look at PSE to PSE, and PSE to Work, studying only the later parts of the student career.
- Nine states address the PSE to PSE transition only.
- Five states address the K-12 to PSE transition only.
- Two states show some other pattern, and two do not address any student transitions.

Types of data used. The survey asked about three different types of data that may be used to address student transitions: (1) "unit record database," defined as a database containing information in records that are individually identified by social security number, where the information is typically provided by institutions; (2) "survey," defined as a data collection effort in which information is collected directly from individuals; and (3) "aggregate/other data," where "aggregate" refers to data summarized at the group level, and "other" refers to data collected from some other kind of format or process. We found that states use all of these types of data to examine student transitions, and many use multiple approaches. Table 1 provides national summary information, and state-by-state information is found in Table B-1 in the appendix.

Table 1
Student Transition Areas Addressed by Type of Data Used
(Number of States)

	K-12 to PSE	PSE to PSE	PSE to Work	Work to PSE	No. of States
Unit Record Database	20	35	11	0	39
Survey	6	5	9	1	14
Aggregate/Other Data	15	12	3	3	24
No. of States	33	42	21	4	48

Note: Since multiple types of data can be used to address multiple transition areas, the "number of states" for each row and column is smaller than the sum of its respective cells.

Use of unit record databases. Unit record databases are used to study the three major student transition areas, and 39 states in total employ this approach. These databases are most frequently used to study PSE to PSE, cited by 35 of the 42 states that study this transition (83 percent). This finding is not surprising since, in effect, that is what unit record databases are explicitly designed to do and why many of these databases came into being. In fact, as earlier SHEEO studies pointed out, one of the major factors motivating the development of state-level unit record databases in the 1990s was the 1990 Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act that required the tracking of postsecondary student outcomes. For the most part, these state unit record databases cover the vast majority of public two- and four-year institutions, but do not permit study of movement between the public and private sector, or movement between states.

Increasingly, states are using unit record data to address issues outside of postsecondary education as well. Twenty of the 33 states studying the K-12 to PSE transition (61 percent) use unit record databases to do so, at least in part, and 11 of the 21 states examining PSE to Work (52 percent) use them for this purpose.

Use of surveys. Surveys are used in only 14 states to address student transitions, but play a strong role in the study of PSE to Work. Nine of the 21 states addressing this transition area (43 percent) use survey data, by far its most frequent use. Typically, this takes the form of a follow-up survey of postsecondary alumni at a given time out of college (e.g. one year out). Accountability--the need to report employment of completers--seems to be a major motivating factor behind these surveys.

Only six of the 33 states looking at the K-12 to PSE transition (18 percent) use surveys to do so, and four of these six states use other kinds of data as well to address this area. Still fewer--only 5 of 42 states (12 percent)--use surveys to look at PSE to PSE issues, and not a single state uses survey data only to look at this transition area. While these surveys can produce some useful information about specific policy questions, it seems quite rare to find them used as the sole source of information on these transition areas.

Use of aggregate/other data. We asked about aggregate/other data with no particular expectations in mind and were somewhat surprised to see the extent to which these data types are currently being used. In fact, aggregate/other data continue to be used even when unit record and survey data are available to states: 24 states in total noted their use. Specifically, aggregate/other data are quite frequently used in the study of the K-12 to PSE transition, cited by 15 of the 33 states that address this transition area (45 percent). We speculate that this involves using aggregate data on high school graduates and comparing this to college enrollment data. This might be necessary in states where K-12 unit record data are not available, but questions of college-going rates, access and equity, and other important policy questions still need to be addressed.

Aggregate/other data are used by 12 of the 42 states studying PSE to PSE (29 percent), and by three of the 21 states studying PSE to Work (14 percent). These data are also used by three of the four states that look at Work to PSE transition issues.

These findings serve as a reminder that even when supposedly stronger sources of data exist, there are still some instances where aggregate data can be effective. They may provide cheap, readily available estimates that have important policy applications.

Summary. We can sum up this section by re-stating the findings above so that they focus on transition areas rather than data types. Clearly, there is no obvious "one size fits all" solution for the study of all student transitions.

- **K-12 to PSE.** States addressing these transition issues for the most part use unit record databases (61 percent) and aggregate/other data (45 percent). While some surveys exist (18 percent of states addressing this area), there are only two states in which this is the only data type used to address this transition area.
- **PSE to PSE.** Study in this transition area is strongly dominated by the use of unit record databases. Eighty-three percent of states addressing this area use unit record data, compared to 29 percent of states that use aggregate/other data and 12 percent of states that use survey data.
- **PSE to Work.** This is the area where surveys are most frequently used (43 percent), nearly reaching the level of use of unit record databases (52 percent). Aggregate data are used by only 14 percent of states addressing this area.

- **Work to PSE.** Only four states indicated they address this transition area, and three of them use aggregate/other data to do so. One state uses a survey, and no one uses unit record data to address the Work to PSE transition area.

UNIT RECORD DATA SYSTEMS

Current status and trends. A 1995 SHEEO survey described the current status of statewide unit record databases, and a summary table from the 1995 survey report is reproduced as Table B-2 in the appendix. That study revealed that 32 states had comprehensive statewide databases at the SHEEO level, containing records from four-year and two-year public institutions; that nine states had less comprehensive, multi-institutional databases at the SHEEO level or elsewhere; and that nine states had no multi-institutional databases in existence in the states. While the current survey has a different focus--concentrating on student transitions rather than unit record databases per se--it is still possible to make some comparisons over time.

In fact, the amount of stability in this area since 1995, rather than change, is most noteworthy. Only one state--Alabama--has moved from having no databases in the state to having a comprehensive statewide database, raising that number to 33 states. Within the past year, Alabama completed its pilot-testing phase and now has its statewide database in place.

Also, first steps have been taken toward developing databases in at least three other states where no multi-institutional databases existed in 1995, but these databases are not yet in place. Rhode Island reports they are "moving toward" a student unit record data system, and Delaware is in the process of developing a data system. The Wyoming Community College Commission and the University of Wyoming, along with the State Department of Education, have appointed a Computer Information and Utilization Task Force to deal with these issues, and that body is now in development.

Another area of stability relates to those states in which the SHEEO agency does not have a comprehensive database or is not the "owner" of the statewide database system. It is noteworthy that in several of these states, considerable database activity and linkages continue to exist statewide, but the SHEEO role in this has not changed substantially. For example, the survey we

sent to the Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board was forwarded to and completed by the Washington State Graduate Follow-up Study. Rather than the coordinating board, this agency works with several agencies in the state to assist in the collection, analysis, and reporting of student transition data. In South Dakota, the Board of Regents does not maintain any student transition data systems, but rather contributes information to the South Dakota Department of Labor Follow-up Project which links postsecondary data to Unemployment Insurance records, employer surveys, and other data sources. In Oregon, the Shared Information System (SIS), developed by the legislature in 1989, is currently operated by the Oregon Employment Department; community colleges participate in SIS through the Oregon Community College Unified Reporting System (OCCURS). Finally, the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP) is an interagency data collection system which links many statewide database and obtains follow-up data on former students. These instances are presented as examples only and do not constitute a comprehensive list. They do suggest, however, an alternative model to the one in which the SHEEO-level postsecondary database is at the center of the statewide database system.

In sum, the 1995 picture of statewide unit record databases remains relatively unchanged after nearly four years. Following a decade or more of fairly rapid database development, the pace of change seems to have slowed down. The reasons for this may vary from state to state and would merit further study.

Data linkages. Twenty-eight states currently link their postsecondary unit record databases to some other kind of database on a record-by-record basis. Table 2 summarizes the types of linkages in place, and state-by-state details are provided in Table B-3 in the appendix. While a slim majority of states have at least one linkage in place, no type of linkage is particularly widespread across the country. Linkages to ACT/SAT are most frequent, and this represents a special type of arrangement that does not involve other statewide agencies. Next most common are linkages to community college databases, Unemployment Insurance databases, and State Department of Education (K-12) databases.

Table 2
Postsecondary Database Linkages to Other Types of Unit Record Data

Type of Data Linkage	No. of States
ACT/SAT	17
Community college database	12
Unemployment Insurance databases	12
State Department of Education/K-12 data	10
Public sector employment data	6
Federal training	6
Postsecondary agencies or institutions in other states or other data sharing consortia	5
Independent college database	2
Private sector employers	2
Total number of states with data linkages	28

Some limited comparisons to 1995 findings are possible, by matching only those categories that were studied in both years. (We excluded three items found in the 1999 questionnaire that were not available in 1995--linkages to ACT/SAT, independent college, and community college databases.) Looking at comparable linkages only, we identified 18 states that have data linkages in place in 1999, compared to 16 states in 1995. This may be indicative of a modest growth in inter-agency data sharing. In addition, other data gathered in the previous survey suggest that expansion of data sharing may not have lived up to 1995 expectations. The 1995 survey asked which states were "in the discussion/planning stage" for implementing future data sharing arrangements, and nine states which had no linkages in place then indicated specific data linkages were in the discussion/planning stage. Adding the actual linkages in place plus those under consideration in 1995, we can estimate that a total of 25 states might have been expected to have some data linkages in place by now--nearly four years after the 1995 data were collected. Comparing a predicted 25 states to the actual number of 18, we might then interpret the findings to represent a noticeable slow-down in development of inter-agency data sharing. One possible explanation is that growing concerns about confidentiality issues and FERPA restrictions have slowed down the growth of inter-agency data linkages. Whether this trend continues, however, especially in the light of federal legislation calling for more data on workforce outcomes, remains to be seen; further investigation is clearly called for.

High school feedback reports. Twenty-one states indicated that their organizations produce a high school feedback report based on unit record data, and another is in the planning stages. These states are listed in Table B-4 in the appendix. In most cases, this means that unit record data on high school performance (either from K-12, ACT/SAT, or admissions databases) have been linked with postsecondary unit record data. The feedback report itself provides aggregate level data back to secondary schools.

In 1995, 23 states indicated they produced a high school feedback report, suggesting there has been no growth in this activity. In fact, we compared the actual states producing reports in both years and found that four new states have begun to produce these reports since 1995, while five states are no longer doing so. It is important to keep in mind that not all feedback reports are produced on a regular basis, and those developed as special projects or on a trial basis may have been more likely to be discontinued during this time period.

SURVEYS

Current status. Many state agencies conduct a variety of surveys on a regular or ad hoc basis. When asked in question 4 to indicate whether certain types of surveys are conducted in their states, 24 respondents indicated that at least some of these surveys are done. This finding contrasts with responses to question 1 which asks about use of surveys to address student transitions; in that case, only 14 states replied in the affirmative. Given these discrepant responses, we made a few follow-up calls to find out more about survey use in the states. We learned that surveys may be conducted, but not always to address student transitions. Some surveys are used more for accountability purposes than policy purposes, and some surveys are not used much at all. This suggests an area for further follow-up investigation: just why are surveys conducted, and how are they being used?

We did learn that surveys take a variety of forms: some are developed in-house by SHEEO agencies, some use ACT-generated or other standardized survey instruments, and some are conducted outside the SHEEO agency. Table 3 summarizes the kinds of surveys currently being conducted in the states, and Table B-5 in the appendix provides state-by-state details. By and

large, alumni/postsecondary follow-up surveys and postsecondary student surveys (such as freshman or senior surveys) are most common, and these are most often conducted on a regular basis. Employer surveys and adult/general population surveys are more likely to be conducted on an ad hoc basis.

Table 3
Types of Surveys Conducted
(Number of States)

	Regular	Ad Hoc	Total
Alumni/postecondary follow-up survey	11	3	15[1]
Postsecondary student survey	11	3	14
Employer survey	3	8	11
Secondary student follow-up survey	4	3	8[1]
Adult/general population survey	0	5	5
Employee survey	3	2	5

[1] *Total is greater than the sum of columns because regular/ad hoc status is unknown for one survey of this type.*

We encourage readers to read the footnotes in Table B-5 for additional information on survey use. For example, in Connecticut, the Department of Education conducts a secondary follow-up survey each fall to determine whether the previous spring's high school graduates have continued their education (and if so, in what kind of institution), have gone into the armed services, have taken employment, or are engaged in some other activity. In Illinois, a survey of university seniors' satisfaction with higher education and plans for future work and education began as an ad hoc project, but is becoming a regular survey. In Arkansas, the ACT Alumni Survey had been used for two years as part of a performance funding measure; however, when performance funding was discontinued two years ago, so was the survey.

Survey linkages. One way to increase the utility of student surveys is to link survey data to other unit record databases on a record-by-record basis. This provides a richer database and reduces the number of background questions that need to be asked in the survey itself. Our survey asked about a number of kinds of data linkages, and found the following: five states link survey data to unit record databases, three to ACT/SAT data, one to high school transcripts, and one to postsecondary transcripts. (See Table B-6 in the appendix.) How this is done and whether this is useful might be the subject for further inquiry.

DATA CONTENT OF STUDENT TRANSITION DATA SYSTEMS

The NPEC Working Group was particularly interested in the data content of student transition data systems. As a result, respondents were given a list of data categories and asked which ones "are encompassed by your student transition data systems." In retrospect, there are a couple of difficulties with this question wording which have produced somewhat unclear and incomplete findings. First, it may be difficult to obtain accurate counts when such general categories are used. Written comments indicated that some respondents struggled over whether or not to check a category if they had only limited data in that area. Second, the question might have been clearer if it asked about data systems in general, not just about student transition data systems. While we were clear that we were interested in student transition data systems, respondents may not have been as clear as to what to count--if something is in a data system but not used to address student transitions, should it be checked? Based on the number of comments and qualified answers we received, we believe these findings may be problematic.

Table 4 summarizes findings on data content of student transition data systems, and Table B-7 in the appendix gives state-by-state detail. Given the above concerns, readers are cautioned to interpret this information as approximate at best. For example, while student demographic

Table 4
Types of Data Encompassed by Student Transition Data Systems
(45 Respondents)

	No. of States
Student demographic characteristics	39
Learner outcomes from college	32
Postsecondary provider characteristics	29
Learner outcomes from high school	26
Postsecondary experiences	26
High school provider characteristics	25
Student finances, charges, and aid	20
Educational aspirations, attitudes, and values	14
Student satisfaction with college	13
Employee status	12
Employer characteristics	11
Barriers to postsecondary education	4

characteristics were most frequently cited, it is curious that only 39 of 45 respondents answering this question checked this category; we would expect it to be a universal data element found in all data systems. To fully understand the content of student transition data systems, more detail may need to be gathered.

DATA AND POLICY ISSUES

Data issues. Respondents were given a list of nine data issues and asked whether each is "successfully addressed," there is "some concern," or whether it is a "significant problem" in their states. Forty-three states responded to this question, and where an issue was not relevant in a given state, respondents either indicated "not applicable" or skipped individual items.

There are several ways to analyze the data presented in Table 5. We began by looking at the "not applicable" (n/a) column only, in order to determine which data issues seemed to be most relevant to respondents (those with the fewest n/a responses). The most relevant issues are: "timeliness of data," "ownership and control of data," "privacy and confidentiality," and "burden on data providers." Least relevant by far is "sampling and estimation."

We then subtracted the n/a responses from the totals and calculated percentages for only those states where the issue was relevant. One way to cut into the data is to look at how many states are "successfully addressing" each issue. The issues most frequently successfully addressed by states are:

- How to define universe of institutions/providers (74 percent)
- How to define "student" (68 percent)
- Ownership and control of data (60 percent)
- Obtaining trend data (52 percent)
- Privacy and confidentiality (49 percent)

At the other end, only 12 percent of states have successfully addressed the issue of "burden on data providers."

Table 5
Degree of Difficulty in Addressing Data Issues
(Listed in Descending Order by Number of States Successfully Addressing Issue)
(43 Respondents)

	Successfully Addressed	Some Concern	Significant Problem	Not Applicable
How to define universe of Institutions/providers	26 (74%)	9 (26%)	0 (0%)	8
How to define "student"	25 (68%)	12 (32%)	0 (0%)	6
Ownership and control of data	25 (60%)	11 (26%)	6 (14%)	1
Obtaining trend data	21 (52%)	17 (42%)	2 (5%)	3
Privacy and confidentiality	20 (49%)	10 (24%)	11 (27%)	2
Timeliness of data	15 (35%)	20 (47%)	8 (19%)	0
Cost	11 (28%)	23 (59%)	5 (13%)	4
Keeping up with technology	9 (23%)	25 (64%)	5 (13%)	4
Sampling and estimation	7 (28%)	15 (60%)	3 (12%)	18
Burden on data providers	5 (12%)	27 (66%)	9 (22%)	2

Another way to cut into the data is to look at which data issues remain "significant problems." The issues most frequently cited as significant problems are:

- Privacy and confidentiality (27 percent)
- Burden on data providers (22 percent)
- Timeliness of data (19 percent)

No respondents felt "how to define student" or "how to define universe of institutions/providers" are significant problems.

Perhaps the most unusual finding here is that "privacy and confidentiality" appears on both lists: it is both "successfully addressed" by many states and a "significant problem" in many states. In fact, few people are neutral on this issue. This topic is addressed in a later section of the report which summarizes respondents' replies to open-ended questions.

A final point pertaining to this and the next section is that these findings are most valuable in terms of the general impressions they provide for us and questions that they raise. They are clearly subjective items, and the answers should not be interpreted as objectively accurate pictures of what is happening in the states.

Usefulness of data to support policy development. Respondents were asked to review a list of policy issues related to student transitions and to indicate whether their data systems are "generally adequate to support policy development in this area," "partly adequate/needing more work," or "not at all adequate/no data are available in this area." Respondents could also indicate that their agency does not address the issue at this time. Forty-nine states responded to this question, and Table 6 summarizes the findings.

Table 6
Usefulness of Data Systems to Support Policy Development
(Listed in Descending Order by Adequacy of Data System)
(49 Respondents)

	Adequate	Partly Adequate	Not At All Adequate	Do Not Address
Student progress; degree completion; time to degree	25	14	3	8
Transfer and articulation	18	21	5	6
Financial aid	15	13	5	17
Admissions	15	12	5	18
Participation patterns; mobility/ migration of students	13	18	6	13
Remediation	10	19	7	14
Licensure/certification	8	13	5	24
Employment following college	7	9	8	26
Student satisfaction	6	7	6	31
High school student preparation	5	20	5	20
Access; barriers to participation	3	16	9	22
Mobility/migration of college graduates	3	9	13	25
Workforce development/employer needs	2	11	11	26

As a broad generalization, it seems that more states address PSE to PSE transition issues than issues that relate to K-12 or work, and that data systems are more adequate to deal with PSE to PSE transition issues than with the other kinds of transition issues. For example, 25 states have data systems generally adequate to address "student progress/degree completion," and another 14 have systems that are at least partly adequate; only eight states do not address these issues. At the other extreme, only two states have data systems adequate to address workforce

development/employer needs, while 11 states have systems that are partly adequate; more than half the states do not even address this issue.

The critical question to pose at this point addresses how these factors relate to one another. Is the absence of adequate data systems hindering policy development in specific areas, or does lack of interest in these issues account for the lack of adequate data systems? Clearly, the data system issues are challenging ones, but if the policy need is there, it would seem better solutions need to be worked out. It would be most useful to further explore what is happening in states where the policy interest is there, but the data systems are not adequate.

STEPS TO BE TAKEN

At the end of the survey, respondents were given the opportunity to answer two open-ended questions about next steps that need to be taken, one focusing on data issues and concerns, and one focusing on improving the utility of data to support policy development. The answers to these questions often overlapped, and we have grouped responses into a single list. Respondents most want to see steps taken to address the following issues:

1. ***Privacy/confidentiality.*** Mentioned more often than any other concern, states want resolution of privacy issues related to use of student unit record data. Some are asking for general guidance or legal opinion relative to FERPA. They want answers to such questions as: What can be linked and under what conditions? Does a particular kind of sharing fall under FERPA guidelines?

   Others are asking less for general information and more for removal of legal barriers or the easing up of FERPA limitations so that data can be merged across agencies for the purposes of research and policy making. When referring to collecting data at the student level but reporting in aggregate, one commented: "We handle our own student data in a confidential manner. Why would we not handle data on these same students before they come to us or after they leave us in the same manner?"

   Respondents mentioned the need for both state and federal legislative action and/or legal opinion relative to privacy and confidentiality issues.

2. ***Data sharing.*** Many states see the need to link data systems across education sectors (K-12, community colleges, universities, independents), to link with employment data, and to follow students across state lines. One commented simply: "We need to link to all databases." One

element of this clearly relates to privacy/confidentiality issues; these must be resolved before data systems can be linked. However, more is at stake than simply lack of obstacles; there needs to be positive interest in linking data as well, if varied agencies are going to commit resources to the effort. Respondents pointed out the need to encourage the support, cooperation, and interest of employers, K-12 systems, and others.

In terms of general approaches, one respondent mentioned building on the TransferTrack system. Another mentioned the Western States Data Sharing Consortium.

3. ***Developing statewide databases.*** For states without any statewide databases, next steps are more basic: they see the need for better access to data within their states and support the move toward statewide postsecondary unit record data systems. A few mentioned the need for statutory authority to develop such databases, and one suggested they get a state law passed requiring institutional data be shared or there be "a real penalty."

4. ***Consistent definitions.*** Many respondents want to see clear, consistent, and unchanging data definitions, and some were generally supportive of recent efforts in this area. One commented that this has gotten better in recent years, and another wanted to "keep the current conversations going." Specific issues mentioned include: (1) how to crosswalk between major, occupation, and industry, and (2) race/ethnicity.

5. ***Data burden.*** Several respondents see the need for more creative ways to minimize data burden. They commented that data usefulness is proportionate to the reporting burden, that there is a trade-off between data value and the data burden. Their suggestions include:

   - Learning how to make decisions with incomplete data.
   - Developing policy questions prior to data collection to reduce the volume of data needed.
   - Developing decision-support methods that do not depend on the perpetual tracking of individuals.
   - Focusing on the most crucial data needed, not on everything anyone can think of that might be useful.
   - Improving the quality of sample surveys.

6. ***Resource issues.*** Several respondents mentioned resource/management issues within their states. These see the need for:

   - Financial commitment to system development.
   - System redesign of data tools (modernization).
   - Professional training using more up-to-date query languages.
   - More adaptable computer systems.
   - Time, organizational support, and a strategic plan.
   - More technology, more personnel, more time.
   - Easier access for a greater number of staff.

7. ***Other issues.*** Other steps that need to be taken include:

   - Addressing the issue of timeliness of data.
   - Addressing the issue of reliability/accuracy of data.
   - Rethinking definitions of "student."
   - Taking a broader approach to student progress; doing some limited tracking of students from earlier grades, looking for factors that might ultimately result in remediation.
   - Making a standard, core set of peer institution data available on the web.

SUGGESTIONS FOR ONGOING STUDY

Several study findings have suggested areas for further investigation. More in-depth research would be valuable to address the following questions:

1. What is the status of statewide linked database systems? Why aren't more states involved? A number of extensive systems are in place, but the total number of states is relatively limited. Has inter-agency data sharing slowed down? If so, is this due to lack of interest, lack of money, better alternatives, barriers due to privacy concerns, or what?

2. How can surveys be used more effectively to address student transition issues? What are the best models for this? How might linkages between survey data and other data sources enhance the value of this approach?

3. Which data sources--unit record systems, surveys, or aggregate/other data--are currently used to generate each category of data crucial to the study of student transitions? What are the strengths, weaknesses, and best ways to obtain each category of data?

4. How do states develop policy in the absence of adequate data systems?

5. Issues of privacy and confidentiality of student records seem to pose more of a barrier for some states than others. Why is this the case, and what can be done about it? Can decisive federal action minimize state-level problems?

6. The trade-off between data value and data burden has been pointed out. What creative, efficient approaches exist to studying student transitions? If we don't have to know everything about everyone, what do we need to know?

Appendix A

STATE HIGHER EDUCATION EXECUTIVE OFFICERS
STUDY OF STUDENT TRANSITION DATA SYSTEMS
February, 1999

Section I: Overview

1. Please indicate (√) which types of data your agency currently uses to address each transition area below, or whether your agency does not address this transition area at this time. *Check all data types that apply in each row.*

   Note: " unit record database" is defined as a database containing information in records that are individually identified by SSN or other identifier; information is typically provided by institutions. "Survey" is defined as a data collection effort in which information is collected directly from individuals. "Aggregate" refers to data summarized at the group level, and "other" refers to data collected from some other kind of format or process.

Transition Areas	Data Types Used to Address Transition			Do Not Address Transition At This Time
	Unit Record Database	Survey	Aggregate/ Other Data	
K-12 to postsecondary				
Postsecondary to postsecondary				
Postsecondary to work				
Work to postsecondary				

If your agency does not address any student transitions at this time, please skip to question 9 on page 4.

Section II: Unit Record Systems

2. *Please complete this section if your agency uses unit record data to address student transitions. (If your agency does not use unit record data, skip to Section III on the next page.)*

   Please indicate (√) whether you link your unit record data to other kinds of data on a record-by-record basis (using SSN or other identifier). *Check all that apply.*

Unit Record Data Linked To:	√
State Department of Education/K-12 data	
ACT/SAT	
Independent college database *(Check only if linked to a separate independent college database.)*	
Community college database *(Check only if linked to a separate community college database.)*	
Postsecondary agencies or institutions in other states or other data sharing consortia *(Describe.)*	
Unemployment Insurance databases	
Public sector employment data (e.g., federal, state, military)	
Federal training (e.g., JTPA, Welfare-to-Work)	
Private sector employers	

3. Does your organization produce a high school feedback report based on unit record data?

____ Yes ____ No

Section III: Surveys. *If your agency does not conduct any surveys, skip to Section IV on the next page.*

4. Please indicate (√) which of the following types of surveys are conducted by your agency on a regular basis or on an *ad hoc* basis. *Check all that apply.*

Type of Survey	Regular Basis	*Ad Hoc* Basis
Secondary student follow-up survey		
Postsecondary student survey (e.g. freshman survey)		
Alumni/postsecondary follow-up survey		
Adult or general population survey		
Employer survey		
Employee survey		
Other *(Describe)*		

Optional comments:

5. Please indicate (√) whether you link your survey data to other kinds of data on a record-by-record basis (using SSN or other identifier). *Check all that apply.*

Survey Data Linked To:	√
Unit record database	
High school transcripts	
Postsecondary transcripts	
ACT/SAT data	
Other *(Describe.)*	

Optional comments:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section IV: Data Content and Issues

6. Please indicate (√) which of the following types of data are encompassed by your student transition data systems. *Check all that apply.*

Type of Data	√
Student demographic characteristics	
High school provider characteristics (e.g., control, size, location)	
Learner outcomes from high school (e.g., coursework, GPA, test scores)	
Educational aspirations, attitudes, and values	
Student finances, charges, and aid	
Barriers to postsecondary education	
Postsecondary provider characteristics (e.g., control, classification, size, location)	
Postsecondary experiences (e.g., remedial coursework)	
Learner outcomes from college (e.g., degrees awarded, licensure)	
Student satisfaction with college	
Employer characteristics (e.g., industry classification, size, location, satisfaction)	
Employee status (e.g., occupational classification, earnings, satisfaction)	
Other *(Describe.)*	

7. Please indicate (√) the relative degree of difficulty that is encountered in addressing the following data issues. *Check one in each row.*

Data Issue	Successfully Addressed	Some Concern	Significant Problem
Timeliness of data			
Obtaining trend data			
Sampling and estimation			
Privacy and confidentiality			
Ownership and control of data			
Cost			
Burden on data providers			
Keeping up with technology			
How to define "student"			
How to define universe of institutions/providers			
Other *(Describe.)*			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Section V: Usefulness of Data Systems to Support Policy Development

8. Good data are needed to support policy development related to a variety of student transition issues. For each policy area below, please indicate (√) whether your data systems are (1) generally adequate to support policy development in this area, (2) partly adequate/needing more work, or (3) not at all adequate/no data are available in this area. *Check one in each row.*

Policy Area	Adequate	Partly Adequate	Not At All Adequate	Do Not Address At This Time
High school student preparation				
Admissions				
Remediation				
Financial aid				
Access; barriers to participation				
Student progress; degree completion; time to degree				
Transfer and articulation				
Participation patterns; mobility/migration of students				
Student satisfaction				
Employment following college				
Licensure/certification				
Mobility/migration of college graduates				
Workforce development/employer needs				
Other *(Describe.)*				

Optional comments:

Section VI: Optional Questions. *We value your time! While we welcome the responses of all of you to the following questions, we know your time is limited. Please feel free to provide as little or as much information as you please.*

9. What are the most important steps that need to be taken to address your data issues and concerns?

10. What are the most important steps that states, institutions, and/or the federal government could take to improve the utility of data at points of student transition to support policy development?

Respondent Information	
Agency/Organization:	
Respondent:	
Title:	
Phone:	Fax:
E-mail:	

THANK YOU FOR PROVIDING THIS INFORMATION. Please fax your reply to Alene Russell at 303-296-8332 by February 22 or mail your responses to the SHEEO office.

Appendix B

Table B-1
Student Transition Areas Addressed by Types of Data Used
(U=Unit Record Database; S=Survey Data; A= Aggregate/Other Data)

	Student Transition Area			
	K-12 to PSE	PSE to PSE	PSE to Work	Work to PSE
Alabama	U	U, S, A		
Alaska[1]		U	U	
Arizona	A	A		
Arkansas	U	U		
California	A	U		
Colorado	U	U	S	
Connecticut	S[2]	U		
Delaware	S			
Florida	U	U	U	A
Georgia	U,A	U	[3]	
Hawaii	U	U	S	S
Idaho	U	U		
Illinois	U	A	U	
Indiana		U	S	A
Iowa		A		
Kansas		A	A	
Kentucky	A	U	S	
Louisiana		U		
Maine				
Maryland	U	U	S	
Massachusetts		U		
Michigan	A		A	
Minnesota	U	U		
Mississippi	U	U		
Missouri	U,A	U,S,A	U,S	
Nebraska	A			
Nevada	U[4],S,A			
New Hampshire[5]	U			
New Jersey		U,A		
New Mexico	A	U		
New York		A	A	
North Carolina	S,A	U,A	U,S	A
North Dakota		U[4]		
Ohio		U		
Oklahoma	A	U	U	
Oregon	U,S	U,S		
Pennsylvania	A			
Puerto Rico		U		
Rhode Island	A	A		
South Carolina		U,A	U	
South Dakota	U	U	U[6]	
Tennessee		U		
Texas	U	U	U[7]	
Utah	A	U		
Vermont[8]	U,S	S	S	
Virginia		U		
Washington	U	U	U	

	Student Transition Area			
	K-12 to PSE	PSE to PSE	PSE to Work	Work to PSE
West Virginia		U	U	
Wisconsin	U,A	U,S[4],A	S[4]	
Wyoming				

[1]Reflects responses from the University of Alaska System only. The Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education does not address these transition areas.
[2]Conducted by the State Department of Education.
[3]In planning stage.
[4]Limited.
[5]Reflects responses from the University System of New Hampshire. The New Hampshire Postsecondary Education Commission does not address these transition areas.
[6]Contribute to the Department of Labor follow-up project.
[7]With State Occupational Information Coordinating Council.
[8]Reflects responses from the University of Vermont. For the most part, the Vermont State Colleges do not address these transition areas. However, they currently have a pilot project with one high school which links high school data with college performance data on a unit record basis; they are planning to expand this into a systemwide model in the future.

Table B-2
Status of Statewide Student Unit Record Databases: Results from a 1995 SHEEO Survey

Comprehensive statewide database exists at the SHEEO level, containing student records from four-year and two-year public institutions (N=32)		
Alaska	Louisiana	North Dakota
Arkansas	Maine	Ohio
California	Maryland	Oklahoma[1, 2]
Colorado[1]	Massachusetts	South Carolina
Connecticut	Minnesota[1, 2]	Tennessee
Georgia	Missouri	Texas
Hawaii	Nevada	Utah
Idaho	New Hampshire	Virginia[1, 2]
Illinois	New Jersey	West Virginia
Indiana[1]	New Mexico	Wisconsin
Kentucky[1]	North Carolina	
Statewide database exists at the SHEEO level, but it is not comprehensive (N=5)		
Mississippi[3]	Vermont[4]	
Oregon[3]	Washington[5]	
South Dakota[3]		
Significant multi-institutional databases exist, but not at the SHEEO level (N=2)		
Florida[6]		
New York[7]		
More limited multi-institutional databases exist (N=2)		
Arizona[8]		
Pennsylvania[9]		
No multi-institutional databases exist (N=9)		
Alabama	Kansas	Nebraska
Delaware	Michigan	Rhode Island
Iowa	Montana	Wyoming

[1]Also contains student records from at least some independent, non-profit colleges.
[2]Also contains student records from at least some proprietary schools.
[3]Contains four-year institutional data only.
[4]Separate databases exist for the University of Vermont and the Vermont State Colleges System; this survey collected information from the Vermont State Colleges only.
[5]Limited unit record enrollment data exist, but more complete records on financial aid recipients are collected; extensive tracking capabilities exist across state agencies.
[6]Although no database resides at the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, separate databases exist for the State university System, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program. These databases are linked and students can be tracked across systems.
[7]Separate databases exist for SUNY and CUNY; this survey collected data from SUNY only.
[8]Limited multi-institutional files are under development, separately for three four-year institutions and for community colleges. No detailed system-level data were collected for this survey.
[9]A database exists for the State System of Higher Education, but is not linked to other institutional data. This survey collected information pertaining to this system only.

Source: Russell, Alene Bycer. *Advances in Statewide Higher Education Data Systems*, State Higher Education Executive Officers, October 1995.

Table B-3
Postsecondary Database Linkages to Other Unit Record Systems

	State Dept Of Ed (K-12)	ACT/ SAT	Indep Col	Comm Col	PSE In Other States	Unemp Insur	Public Sector Emp	Fed Training	Private Sector Emp	Other
Alabama	X			X						
Alaska		X			X[1]	X	X	X		
Arkansas		X								
California				X						
Colorado	X[2]					X[2]				
Connecticut										
Florida	X	X		X		X	X	X		
Georgia	X	X		X		[3]				
Hawaii				X						
Idaho					X[4]	[4]				
Illinois	X	X		X						
Indiana										
Kentucky		X								
Louisiana										
Maine										
Maryland		X								
Massachusetts										
Minnesota										
Mississippi										
Missouri	X[5]	X		X	X	X		X		X[6]
Nevada										
New Hampshire		X								
New Jersey		X				X[7]				
New Mexico			X	X						
North Carolina				X		X[8]	X[8]	X[8]	X[8]	
North Dakota					[3]	X				
Ohio				X						
Oklahoma		X			X	X		X		X[9]
Oregon	X									
Puerto Rico										
South Carolina				X		X				
South Dakota	X	X				X	X[10]		X[10]	
Tennessee										
Texas	X	X					X[11]			
Utah										
Vermont		X								
Virginia										
Washington	X	X	X	X	X[12]	X	X	X		
West Virginia		X				X				
Wisconsin		X								

Note: This table includes all states that have unit record data systems in place. A blank line indicates that linkages to other data systems are possible, but none currently exist.

[1]Through Student Loan Clearinghouse.
[2]Special projects only.
[3]In planning or development phase.
[4]Share data with the state of Washington.
[5]Secondary/vocational education completers.
[6]State scholarship, grant, and loan database that includes students enrolled in public and independent 2- and 4- year colleges and universities.
[7]Just beginning--New Jersey Department of Labor--vocational education only.
[8]One shared data project called Common Follow-up System.
[9]Tax Commission, Health Department, SDE personnel and certification, Texas SOICC, Tennessee ESC.
[10]South Dakota Department of Labor follow-up study.
[11]With State Occupational Information Coordinating Council.
[12]Use the format and procedures developed by the Western States Data Sharing Consortium to exchange data with California, Idaho, Oregon, Alaska, and selected private colleges.

Table B-4
High School Feedback Reports

Alabama
Arkansas
Colorado[1]
Florida[2]
Georgia
Hawaii
Illinois
Indiana[3]
Kentucky
Maryland
Massachusetts
Missouri
Nevada
North Carolina
Oklahoma
Oregon
South Dakota
Texas
Virginia
Washington
West Virginia
Wisconsin

[1]Special project.
[2]Another agency does this.
[3]In planning stages.

Table B-5
Types of Surveys Conducted
(R= Survey Conducted on a Regular Basis; A= Ad Hoc Survey)

	Secondary Student Follow-Up	Postsec Student	Alumni/ Postsec Follow-Up	Adult/ General Pop	Employer	Employee
Alabama		R				
Alaska	A	A	A	A	A	A
Arizona		A				
Arkansas			A[1]			
Colorado					A	
Connecticut	R[2]					
Delaware	R					
Florida						R[3]
Georgia		A[4]		A		
Hawaii		R	R	A	A	R
Illinois	R, A[5]	R[6]	R	A	A	A
Indiana			A		A	
Kansas			R			
Kentucky		R[7]	R[7]	A[8]	A[9]	
Maryland			R		A	
Missouri		R	R		A	R[10]
Nevada	A	R[11]	R[11]		R[11]	
North Carolina	R[12]	R[13]	R		R	
Oregon	X		X			
Puerto Rico[14]						
Tennessee	A	R	R			
Vermont		R	R			
Washington[15]						
West Virginia		R[16]				
Wisconsin		R[17]	R[17]		R[17]	

[1]Used the ACT alumni survey for two years as part of a performance funding measure. When performance funding was dropped two years ago, so was the survey. Now there is talk of using it again by the universities as part of a new funding model.
[2]The Connecticut Department of Education does an annual survey in the fall of each year of those students who graduated from high school the previous spring semester. The survey asks whether they have continued their education (if so, kind of institution), gone into the armed services, have taken employment, or other.
[3]Conducted by the Florida Education and Training Placement Information Program (FETPIP).
[4]In fall 1997, administered the ACT Student Opinion Survey to all 34 institutions in system.
[5]As a limited one-time project, conducted ad hoc survey of high school seniors for regional Lake County project to assess demand for higher education.
[6]Conduct survey of public university seniors' satisfaction with higher education and plans for future work and education; this began as an ad hoc project, but will become a regular survey.
[7]Administered by the postsecondary institution as part of the statewide accountability program coordinated by this agency.

[8]Parent survey/focus group.
[9]Focus group.
[10]Counseling for High Skills, a survey developed by ACT.
[11]In planning stages.
[12]Conducted by the Department of Public Instruction.
[13]Includes surveys of second-semester sophomores and graduating seniors.
[14]Will conduct ad hoc surveys in the near future.
[15]Survey work is conducted for each target organization by our Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board.
[16]Conduct a statewide survey of students at or around the time of graduation, dealing primarily with students' satisfaction with their undergraduate experience. There is also a question about their assessment of the preparation they received for their career or postgraduate education. (Does not really gather information about transitions.)
[17]Used more for accountability purposes than analytical purposes.

Table B-6
Linkages of Survey Data to Other Data Systems

	Unit Record Database	High School Transcripts	Postsecondary Transcripts	ACT/ SAT Data
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona			X	X
Arkansas				
Colorado				
Connecticut				
Delaware				
Florida				
Georgia	X			
Hawaii	X			
Illinois		X		X
Indiana				
Kansas				
Kentucky				X[1]
Maryland				
Missouri				
Nevada				
North Carolina	X[2]			
Oregon				
Tennessee	X			
Vermont	X			
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin				

Note: This table includes all states that currently conduct surveys. A blank line indicates that linkages to other data systems are possible, but none currently exist.

[1]ACT links SSN to data furnished by the institutions as part of the high school feedback report.
[2]Unit record data contains information from the high school transcript, the college transcript, and SAT scores.

Table B-7
Types of Data Encompassed by Student Transition Data Systems

	Student Demo-graphics	High School Provider	Learner Outcomes From High School	Educ Aspir-ations/ Attitudes/ Values	Student Finances/ Charges/ Aid	Barriers To PSE	PSE Provider
Alabama	X		X				
Alaska	X	X			X		
Arizona	X		X				
Arkansas	X		X	X			X
California	X	X	X				X
Colorado	X						
Connecticut	X	X					
Delaware		X		X			X
Florida	X	X	X	X	X		X
Georgia	X						X
Hawaii	X	X		X	X		
Idaho	X	X	X		X		X
Illinois	X	X	X		X		X
Indiana	X	X	X		X		X
Iowa			X		X		X
Kansas	X		X				
Kentucky		X	X				X
Louisiana	X						
Maryland	X	X	X	X	X		X
Massachusetts	X	X	X				
Michigan	X						X
Minnesota	X	X					X
Mississippi							
Missouri	X	X	X	X	X		X
Nevada	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
New Hampshire	X	X	X	X			
New Jersey	X	X			X		X
New Mexico	X	X			X		X
North Carolina	X	X	X		X	X	X
North Dakota	X	X	X	X	X		X
Ohio	X			X			X
Oklahoma	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Oregon	X		X	X		X	X
Pennsylvania	X						
Puerto Rico							X
Rhode Island	X	X	X				
South Carolina	X						
Tennessee	X						X
Texas	X	X	X	X	X		X
Utah							
Vermont	X			X	X		X
Virginia	X		X				X
Washington	X	X	X		X		
West Virginia	X		X		X		X
Wisconsin	X	X	X		X		X

	PSE Experiences	Learner Outcomes From College	Student Satis-faction With College	Employer Charac-teristics	Employee Status
Alabama	X	X			
Alaska		X			
Arizona		X	X		
Arkansas	X	X			
California					
Colorado					
Connecticut					
Delaware					
Florida	X	X			
Georgia	X	X			
Hawaii		X	X	X	X
Idaho	X	X			
Illinois	X	X	X		X
Indiana		X			
Iowa		X			
Kansas		X	X		
Kentucky	X	X	X		
Louisiana		X			
Maryland	X	X	X	X	X
Massachusetts		X			
Michigan	X	X	X		
Minnesota	X				
Mississippi					
Missouri	X	X	X	X	X
Nevada	X	X	X		
New Hampshire					
New Jersey	X	X		X	X
New Mexico	X	X			
North Carolina	X	X	X	X	X
North Dakota		X		X	X
Ohio	X	X			
Oklahoma	X	X		X	X
Oregon	X	X			
Pennsylvania					
Puerto Rico					
Rhode Island	X				
South Carolina		X			X
Tennessee	X		X		
Texas	X	X		X	
Utah	X	X			
Vermont			X	X	X
Virginia	X				
Washington	X	X		X	X
West Virginia	X	X	X	X	X
Wisconsin	X	X			

Note: This table excludes states that (1) do not address any student transitions, or (2) did not answer this question, typically because of very limited activity or because the data they use come from a source other than their agency. An X indicates at least some data of this type are used, but extensive data may not be available.

Appendix C

45

Survey Respondents

Alabama

Janis Colee Lowther
Admin Assistant/Financial Affairs
Commission on Higher Education
P.O. Box 302000
Montgomery, AL 36130-2000
334-242-2106 Fax: 334-242-0270
jlowther@ache.state.al.us

Diane Sherman
Director of Data Systems
Alabama Commission on Higher Education
P.O. Box 302000
Montgomery, AL 36130-2000
334-242-2742 Fax: 334-242-0268
dsherman@ache.state.al.us

Alaska

Diane Barrans
Executive Director
Alaska Postsecondary Education Commission
3030 Vintage Boulevard
Juneau, AK 99801-7109
907-465-6740 Fax: 907-465-3293
dbarrans@acpe.edu.state.ak.us

Pat Pitney
Director of Budget & Institutional Research
University of Alaska System
Statewide Institutional Research
P.O. Box 755260
Fairbanks, AK 99775-5260
907-474-5889 Fax: 907-474-7127
pat.pitney@mail.alaska.edu

Arizona

Christine A. Forester
Research Analyst
Arizona Board of Regents
2020 North Central Ave, Suite 230
Phoenix, AZ 85004
602-229-2525 Fax: 602-229-2555
forester@asu.edu

Arkansas

Carol Futhey
Assistant Director for Research & Planning
Arkansas Department of Higher Education
114 East Capitol
Little Rock, AR 72201
501-371-2066 Fax: 501-371-2002
carolf@adhe.arknet.edu

California

Marc Irish
Assistant Director
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1303 J Street, #500
Sacramento, CA 95814-2938
916-322-8002 Fax: 916-327-4417
mirish@cpec.ca.gov

Colorado

Greg Appling
Policy Research Officer
Colorado Commission on Higher Education
1300 Broadway, 2nd Floor
Denver, CO 80203
303-866-2723 Fax: 303-860-9750
greg.appling@state.co.us

Connecticut

Joseph Zikmund, II
Chief Information Officer
Department of Higher Education
61 Woodland Street
Hartford, CT 06105
860-947-1833 Fax: 860-947-1310
wpzikmund@commnet.edu

Delaware

Marilyn B. Quinn
Executive Director
Delaware Higher Education Commission
820 North French Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
302-577-3240 Fax: 302-577-6765
mquinn@state.de.us

Florida

John Opper
Educational Policy Director
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
224 Collins Bldg
107 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, FL 32399
850-488-7894 Fax: 850-922-5388
opperj@mail.doe.state.fl.us

Georgia

Cathie M. Hudson
Assoc Vice Chancellor, Planning & Budget Analysis
Board of Regents, University System of Georgia
244 Washington Street, S.W.
Atlanta, GA 30334
404-656-2213 Fax: 404-657-4130
chudson@mail.regents.peachnet.edu

Hawaii

Colleen O. Sathre
Vice President for Planning and Policy
University of Hawaii System
2444 Dole Street
Bachman Hall 110
Honolulu, HI 96822
808-956-7075 Fax: 808-956-9119
csathre@hawaii.edu

Idaho

Gerald A. Engstrom
Management Information Officer
State Board of Education
650 W. State Street
Len B. Jordan Bldg., Room 307
Boise, ID 83720-0037
208-334-2270 Fax: 208-334-2632
jengstro@osbe.state.id.us

Illinois

Carol Yoakum
Research Associate
Illinois Board of Higher Education
4 W. Old Capitol Plaza, Room 500
Springfield, IL 62701-1214
217-524-5639 Fax: 217-782-8548
yoakum@ibhe.state.il.us

Indiana

Jeffrey J. Weber
Manager of Information & Research
Indiana Commission for Higher Education
101 W. Ohio St, #550
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1971
317-464-4400 Fax: 317-464-4410
jeffw@che.state.in.us

Iowa

Diana Gonzalez
Asst Director, Academic Affairs
State Board of Regents
100 Court Avenue, Suite 203
Des Moines, IA 50319
515-282-6116 Fax: 515-281-6420
gonzalez@iastate.edu

Kansas

Kim Wilcox
Interim Dir of Academic Affrs & Eisenhower Coord
Kansas Board of Regents
700 SW Harrison, Suite 1410
Topeka, KS 66603-3760
785-296-3422 Fax: 785-296-0983
kim@kbor.state.ks.us

Kentucky

J. Kenneth Walker
Vice President for Finance
Council on Postsecondary Education
1024 Capital Center Drive, #320
Frankfort, KY 40601-8204
502-573-1555 Fax: 502-573-1535
ken.walker@mail.state.ky.us

Louisiana

John Kay
Asst Commissioner for Research & Data Analysis
Louisiana Board of Regents
150 Third Street, #129
Baton Rouge, LA 70801-1389
225-342-4253 Fax: 225-342-9318
kay@regents.state.la.us

Maine

Pat Shaw
University of Maine System
107 Main Avenue
Bangor, ME 04401
207-973-3205 Fax: 207-973-3296

Maryland

Charles N. Benil
Information Systems Director
Maryland Higher Education Commission
The Jeffrey Building
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, MD 21401
410-974-2971 Fax: 410-974-5376
cbenil@mhec.state.md.us

Massachusetts

Edward L. Lamie
Director of Institutional Research
Massachusetts Board of Higher Educatioin
One Ashburton Place, Room 1401
Boston, MA 02108-1696
617-727-7785 Fax: 617-727-0955
elamie@bhe.mass.edu

Michigan

Rhonda Burke
Higher Educ Consultant, Office of Higher Educ
Michigan Department of Education
HEMS - CCSU
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI 48909-7508
517-335-0402 Fax: 517-373-2759
rburkerp@state.mi.us

Minnesota

Alexandra Djurovich
IPEDS Coordinator/Research Associate
Minnesota Higher Education Services Offices
1450 Energy Park Drive, Suite 350
St. Paul, MN 55108-5228
651-642-0586 Fax: 651-642-0675
djurovich@heso.state.mn.us

Mississippi

Susan Silver
Director, Institutional Analysis
Institutions of Higher Learning
3825 Ridgewood Road
Jackson, MS 39206
601-982-6702 Fax: 601-982-5117
susan@ihl.state.ms.us

Missouri

Wei Zhou
Research Director
Coordinating Board for Higher Education
3515 Amazonas Drive
Jefferson City, MO 65109-5717
573-751-2361 Fax: 573-526-0984
wzhou?cbhe400@admin.mocbhe.gov

Nebraska

Carna Pfeil
Associate Director for Finance
Coord Commission for Postsecondary Education
PO Box 95005
140 North 8th Street, #300
Lincoln, NE 68509-5005
402-471-0029 Fax: 402-471-2886
cpfeil@ccpe.state.ne.us

Nevada

Tamela Gorden
Research Analyst
University & Community College System
2601 Enterprise Road
Reno, NV 89512
775-784-4022 Fax: 775-784-1127
gorden@nevada.edu

New Hampshire

James A. Busselle
Executive Director
NH Postsecondary Education Commission
Two Industrial Park Drive
Concord, NH 03301-8512
603-271-2555 Fax: 603-271-2696
j_bussel@tec.nh.us

Robert K. Toutkoushian
Executive Director, Office of Policy Analysis
University System of New Hampshire
Myers Financial Center
27 Concord Road
Durham, NH 03824
603-862-0966 Fax: 603-868-2756
r_toutkoush@usnh.unh.edu

New Jersey

Phillip Beardsley
Dean of Inst Research/Planning
New Jersey Commission on Higher Education
20 West State Street, CN 542
Trenton, NJ 08625-0542
609-984-2847 Fax: 609-292-7225

New Mexico

Liz Jenkins
Associate Director for Policy Analysis
New Mexico Commission on Higher Education
1068 Cerrillos Road
Sante Fe, NM 87501-4295
505-827-7383 Fax: 505-827-7392
liz@che.state.nm.us

New York

Thomas J. McCord
Coord, Office of Research & Information Systems
Office of Higher Education
New York State Education Department
971 Education Building Annex
Albany, NY 12234
518-474-5093 Fax: 518-474-1907
tmccord@mail.nysed.gov

North Carolina

Gary T. Barnes
VP for Program Assessment & Public Ser
Univ of North Carolina, General Administration
P.O. Box 2688
Chapel Hill, NC 27515-2688
919-962-4591 Fax: 919-962-3591
barnes@ga.unc.edu

North Dakota

Michel Hillman
Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
North Dakota University System
600 East Boulevard Avenue
State Capitol Building
Bismarck, ND 58505-0230
701-328-2965 Fax: 701-328-2961
mike_hillman@ndus.nodak.edu

Mary T. McDonald
Institutional Research Analyst
North Dakota State University
P.O. Box 5075
Minard Hall, Room 224
Fargo, ND 58105
701-231-7752 Fax: 701-231-9419
marmcdon@plains.nodak.edu

Ohio

Robert Sheehan
Director, HEI Project
Ohio Board of Regents
65 E. State Street, #820
Columbus, OH 43215-4213
614-728-8863 Fax:
rsheehan@regents.state.oh.us

Oklahoma

Debra L. Stuart
Assoc Vice Chancellor for System Research
Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
500 Education Building, Capitol Complex
Oklahoma City, OK 73105-4500
405-524-9170 Fax: 405-524-9230
dstuart@osrhe.edu

Oregon

Diane Vines
Vice Chancellor, Corporate & Public Affrs
Oregon University System
PO Box 3175
Eugene, OR 97403-0751
503-725-5700 Fax: 503-725-5709
diane_vines@ous.edu

Pennsylvania

Gerald Hottinger
Educational Statistics Supervisor
Pennsylvania Department of Education
Division of Data Services
333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
717-783-6764 Fax: 717-787-3148
00datadiv@psupen.psu.edu

Puerto Rico

Gloria Davila-Casasnova
IPEDS Coordinator
Council on Higher Education
P.O. Box 19900
San Juan, PR 00910-1900
787-724-7100 Fax: 787-721-1275
cesprpol@caribe.net

Rhode Island

Diane K. Reedy
Academic Research Specialist/IPEDS Coordinator
Rhode Island Office of Higher Education
301 Promenade Street
Providence, RI 02908-5748
401-222-2685 Fax: 401-222-6111
dreedy@etal.uri.edu

South Carolina

Camille T. Brown
Coordinator, Management Information Systems
Commission on Higher Education
1333 Main Street, #200
Columbia, SC 29201
803-737-2149 Fax: 803-737-2297
cbrown@che400.state.sc.us

South Dakota

Carol Stonefield
Director of Research and Information
South Dakota Board of Regents
207 East Capitol Avenue
Pierre, SD 57501
605-773-3455 Fax: 605-773-5320
carols@bor.state.sd.us

Tennessee

William McCulley
Director of Academic Programs
Tennessee Higher Education Commission
404 James Robertson Pkwy, #1900
Nashville, TN 37243-0830
615-532-8015 Fax: 615-741-6230
wmcculley@mail.state.tn.us

Texas

David W. Gardner
Deputy Assistant Commissioner
Higher Education Coordinating Board
P.O. Box 12788
Austin, TX 78711
512-483-6140 Fax: 512-483-6149
gardnerdd@thecb.state.tx.us

Utah

Norman Tarbox
Asst Commissioner for Finance and Facilities
Utah State Board of Regents
355 West North Temple
3 Triad Center, Suite 550
Salt Lake City, UT 84180-1205
801-321-7131 Fax: 801-321-7199
ntarbox@utahsbr.edu

Vermont

Fred A. Curran
Director, Institutional Studies
University of Vermont
358 Waterman Building
Burlington, VT 05405-0160
802-656-1167 Fax: 802-656-1363
fred.curran@uvm.edu

Karrin Wilks
Director of Academic Affairs
Vermont State Colleges
PO Box 359
Waterbury, VT 05676-0359
802-241-2520 Fax: 802-241-3369
wilksk@quark.vsc.edu

Virginia

Dorothy A. Bryant
Associate Research Coordinator
State Council of Higher Education for Virginia
James Monroe Building, 10th Floor
101 North Fourteenth Street
Richmond, VA 23219
804-225-3150 Fax: 804-225-2604
bryant@schev.edu

Washington

Jerry Litzenberger
Director
Washington State Graduate Follow-up Study
137005 - 106th Dr. SE
Snohomish, WA 98296
360-668-7030 Fax: 360-668-7030
cougargrad@msn.com

Doug Scrima
Senior Policy Associate
Higher Education Coordinating Board
PO Box 43430
Olympia, WA 98504
360-753-7824 Fax: 360-753-7808
dougs@hecb.wa.gov

West Virginia

Darrell Glenn
Interim Director of Research & Information Systems
State College System of West Virginia
1018 Kanawha Blvd, East, #700
Charleston, WV 25301
304-558-1112 Fax: 304-558-1011
dglenn@scusco.wvnet.edu

Wisconsin

Sharon Wilhelm
Interim Director, Policy Analysis and Research
University of Wisconsin System
1700 Van Hise Hall
1220 Linden Drive
Madison, WI 53706
608-262-3905 Fax: 608-262-3985
swilhelm@ccmail.uwsa.edu

Wyoming

William Lovejoy
Dean of Information, Planning & Policy Analysis
Wyoming Community College Commission
2020 Carey Avenue, 8th Floor
Cheyenne, WY 82002
307-777-6293 Fax: 307-777-6567
blovejoy@antelope.wcc.edu